

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed December 8, 2004 has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. The indication of allowable subject matter in claim 10 is noted with appreciation. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

As set forth above, claims 8, 10-12, and 15 are amended. Claim 16 is added. Claims 8-16 are now pending and submitted for reconsideration.

Objections

Claim 15 was objected to because of an informality. Claim 15 has been amended to correct the informality and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 8-9 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,168,187). The rejection should be withdrawn because Yamada et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of amended claims 1, 12 and 15.

For example, Yamada et al. does not disclose "a covering portion welded to a rear side of the cover to form an integral welded body that covers the bent distal end of the extension" as called for in amended claim 1. Furthermore, Yamada et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest an emblem wherein "the extensions are secured to the rear side of the cover by a welded body that completely surrounds the extensions" as called for in amended claim 12. Still further, it is clear that Yamada et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest an emblem "wherein the rib portions are welded to the cover to form an integral welded body with the cover that surrounds the extensions after the emblem is positioned with the main plate overlying the front side of the cover" as called for in amended claim 15.

Yamada et al. discloses "a substantially square cylindrical rib 19 that surrounds a first leg 23 and a second leg 24." (See Col. 5, lines 7-10). In addition, Yamada et al. discloses that "there is a rib 19 protruding from the head portion 30b of the rivet 30, around the leg

sections 23 and 24 of the ornament 21 on the reverse side of the door section 14.” (See Col. 7, lines 16-20, emphasis added). However, there is no disclosure as to whether the rib is integrally connected to the door section 14. In particular, Yamada et al. does not disclose that the legs 23 and 24 are secured to the rear side of the cover by a welded body that completely surrounds the legs 23 and 24. Instead, as seen in figures 6 and 7, the legs 23 and 24 are attached by other means and the rib 19 merely surrounds the legs 23 and 24. Specifically, as described in Col. 5, lines 63-66, “the first leg section 23 of the ornament 21 is...attached to the door section 14 by the rivet 30.” With regards to the second leg 24, Yamada et al. only states that the leg “is bent and engaged with the circumferential edge of the insertion hole 18.” (See Col. 6, lines 11-12). Yamada et al., clearly discloses that the rib 19 is not “welded to a rear side of the door section to form an integral welded body that covers the bent distal end of the extensions” as called for in amended claim 1. Thus, the inventions of amended claims 1, 12 and 15 are not disclosed and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Each of the claims 7-11 and 13-14 depend from either claims 1 or 12 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons set forth above without regard to the further patentable limitations contained in these dependent claims. These patentable limitations include, for example, a connecting extension, having a distal end including a hole “wherein the welded body is located in the hole.” as called for in amended claim 10. Further, by way of example, Yamada et al. does not disclose a cover wherein the extensions are “completely surrounded by the welded body cover” as claimed in amended claim 11. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7-11 and 13-14 is respectfully requested.

New Claim 16

Claim 16 is added to further define the invention. Support for new claim 16 can be found at least on page 10 of the specification.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 8, 2004

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5582
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Howard N. Shipley
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,370